R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 830 VT 003 997

A STUDY OF A BLOCK-TIME SCHEDULE FOR TEACHING VOCATIONAL OFFICE PRACTICE. FINAL REPORT OF PROJECT 201.

BY- MCBETH, JOHN
MICHIGAN ST. UNIV., EAST LANSING,COLL. OF EDUC.

PUB DATE 67

CONTRACT OEC-5-85-111
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.64 14P.

DESCRIPTORS- *OFFICE OCCUPATIONS EDUCATION, *TIME BLOCKS, *OFFICE PRACTICE, *PILOT PROJECTS, *FLEXIBLE SCHEDULING, PROGRAM PLANNING, GRADE 12, MICHIGAN, ARIZONA, FLORIDA, NEW JERSEY, WASHINGTON,

THIS PROGRESS REPORT ON A PROJECT TO IMPLEMENT A CURRICULUM USING THE BLOCK APPROACH COVERS THE PERIOD JULY 1, 1965, THROUGH NOVEMBER 30, 1966. THE BLOCK-TIME APPROACH TO VOCATIONAL OFFICE EDUCATION UTILIZES TWO OR THREE CONSECUTIVE CLASS PERIODS PER DAY DURING THE HIGH SCHOOL SENIOR YEAR FOR TEACHING THE ADVANCED SECRETARIAL SUBJECTS. THIRTY-NINE PILOT SCHOOLS IN MICHIGAN, ARIZONA, FLORIDA, NEW JERSEY, AND WASHINGTON ARE PARTICIPATING. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY PROVIDES THE CENTRAL PROJECT LEADERSHIP AND NEGOTIATES AND OPERATES THE CONTRACT WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. ONE PERSON FROM EACH STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SERVES AS STATE PROJECT COORDINATOR, AND AN APPOINTED TEACHER-EDUCATOR SERVES AS STATE RESEARCH CONSULTANT. EACH PILOT SCHOOL PROVIDES A QUALIFIED TEACHER, CALLED THE RESEARCH ASSOCIATE, WHO TEACHES THE BLOCK-TIME CLASS ACCORDING TO ONE OF FOUR PLANS--STENOGRAPHIC, MODIFIED STENOGRAPHIC, CLERICAL, OR SPECIAL CLERICAL FOR LOW ACHIEVERS. A GENERAL COURSE OUTLINE AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS WERE DEVELOPED BY THE PROJECT STAFF IN A NATIONAL SEMINAR AND DISTRIBUTED TO ALL PROJECT PERSONNEL. AN EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IS TO BE MADE AT THE END OF THE 1966-67 SCHOOL YEAR. DATA ON CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED BY THE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES TO MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY. A NATIONAL SEMINAR AND STATE WORKSHOPS HAVE BEEN CONDUCTED. DEFINITE PLANS FOR THE FUTURE DEPEND UPON THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS AND CONTINUED WILLINGNESS OF THE STATES AND PILOT SCHOOLS TO PARTICIPATE. (PS)

ED016830

RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAM IN VOCATIONAL
TECHNICAL EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY
EDUCATION & CURRICULUM
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN

VT003997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDY OF A BLOCK-TIME SCHEDULE FOR TEACHING VOCATIONAL OFFICE PRACTICE

A FINAL REPORT OF PROJECT 201

Contract OE5-85-111

This report covers the period July 1, 1965, through November 30, 1966.

This project will be continued during the period covered by contract OEG3-7-0702-11-2679.

PROJECT PERSONNEL

Project Leader

JOHN McBETH
Instructor
Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

Research Assistants

MIKE MOSKOVIS
Doctoral Candidate
in Business Education

MARY ANN PEARSON
Master's Candidate
in Business Education

ROBERT THOMPSON
Master's Candidate
in Business Education

CAROLYN WARDELL
Master's Candidate
in Business Education

Research and Development Program
in Vocational-Technical Education
Department of Secondary Education
and Curriculum

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan
1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page 3 Purposes

page 3 Objectives

page 3 Relationship to Research and Development Program

page 3 Background

page 3 Design and Progress

page 7 The Future

page 9 Appendices

page 6 *Table 1* Location, Number and Size of Pilot Schools

PURPOSES

The block-time approach to vocational office education utilizes two or three consecutive class periods per day during the high school senior year in which to teach the advanced secretarial subjects. A basic assumption is that the block time schedule is an effective approach to teach the secretarial subjects.

The purpose of the project is to implement a curriculum, in clinical schools, using the block approach. Experimental blocks of instruction are scheduled and students are encouraged to progress individually at their own rate through the use of a flexible schedule of activities. This development necessitates the preparing of instructional material and curriculum guides and the training of teachers through seminars and workshops in order to function effectively in a class scheduled for a block of time.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of the block-time approach is to integrate the learning experiences of the students based, whenever possible, on an environmental situation simulating employment conditions. The project uses block-time in which to provide instruction that builds advanced skills, integrates skills and knowledge into behavior patterns characteristic of the office, provides realistic practice through projects in a simulated office environment, and gives flexibility of time to meet individual student learning needs.

Research associates (teachers in block classes) are encouraged to suggest further development and changes in the outline based upon their actual experience in the classroom.

The ultimate objective of the project is improved education for employment in office occupations.

RELATIONSHIP TO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The Vocational Office Block-Time Project is part of a large research and development program in vocational-technical education. The R & D Program is based on a clinical school concept and aims at improving vocational-technical education through

development of an internship pattern of teacher education,

improvement of vocational curricula and administrative patterns, and

allied research, instructional materials development and teacher education through seminars and institutes.

The Vocational Office Block-Time Project is one of four curriculum development projects. The other three projects are (1) Distributive Education Project, (2) Hospitality Education Project, and (3) Rural Schools Project. All four projects utilize pilot schools as sites for development and trial of curricular materials and patterns. Each pilot school serves as a locus for research.

BACKGROUND

Educational programs to prepare youth for entrance into office occupations have been included in the courses of study of public high schools for many years. Some office occupations are readily identified as entry positions in the world of work. However, the Report of the 1963 President's Panel on Vocational Education clearly indicated (1) the need for more programs *designed* to prepare youth for entrance into office occupations and (2) the need to develop new programs which would prepare persons for the newer office occupations as well as to perform the activities resulting from technological changes.

DESIGN AND PROGRESS

SCOPE The project is being conducted in four states in addition to Michigan: Arizona, Florida, New Jersey, and Washington. These states were selected from among several states which expressed the willingness and desire to improve the status of business education in their schools. They have the state leadership necessary to guide and assist in the development of change and progress in their schools.

ORGANIZATION The Vocational Office Block-Time Project is directed by a Project Leader who reports to the R & D Program Director. One person was appointed in the State Department of Education in each state to serve as State Project Coordinator.

The State Project Coordinator acts as a liaison with the research center, selects the pilot schools, assists the State Department of Education in inter-

preting policy and regulations to the pilot schools, and serves as a project consultant.

A State Research Consultant was appointed in each state. This person is a teacher educator in one of the State Teacher Education Institutions within each state, except in New Jersey where the consultant is in the State Department of Education.

The State Research Consultant supervises the research associates, conducts workshops for research associates, gathers data, and serves as a consultant to the local pilot schools and the research project.

The high schools selected by the State Coordinator in each state to participate in the project are designated as pilot schools. Each pilot school provides a qualified teacher called the Research Associate, necessary instructional space, an office for the research associate, and administrative support for the research endeavor. The pilot school provides one period, exclusive of any normal planning period, for the research associate to plan, collect, evaluate, and report data on her class to Michigan State University. The research associate teaches the block-time class. The pilot school provides the teacher time for attendance at conferences and workshops developed for participants in the project. The research associate follows the instructional outline provided by the project.

Michigan State University provides the central project leadership and negotiates and operates the contract with the United States Office of Education. [Michigan State University provides the basic design of the measurement and evaluation schemes and develops and provides curriculum guides, unit outlines, and needed instructional materials or plans.] Michigan State University provides an honorarium, depending on availability of funds under the contract with the USOE, to the pilot school for the one hour of time for the research associate as required by the project.[1] Certain travel and living costs of Research Associates, State Coordinators, and State Research Consultants while traveling are paid by Michigan State University.

CURRICULUM MATERIALS A general course outline and other instructional materials were developed by project staff. These were reviewed and revised by the research associates who participated in a seminar conducted at Michigan State University during June, 1966, for project personnel. The materials were refined and reproduced for distribution to the research associates by August 1, 1966 for use during the 1966-67 school year.

Research associates are encouraged to adapt the course outline to local conditions, but must report the adaptations and reasons for adaptation to the project leader.

Research associates use textbooks that are currently used in the advanced secretarial subjects. The instructional materials developed for the project integrate the different subjects into a single learning experience.

An evaluation of the use of the instructional material will be made during the second semester of the 1966-67 school year. Preliminary messages indicate that research associates are satisfied with the materials.

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION The measurement and evaluation of accomplishments will be conducted on a local school basis and through externally developed materials. Each research associate judges the success of her class based on her subjective opinion and student grades in the different subject areas. Empirical data of this kind is prevalent in education. External measures may consist of follow-up of graduates of all classes; tests, such as civil service examinations, achievement tests in different areas, and employment tests used by industry; and tests to be designed by project staff members.

Opinions of research associates, department heads, and school administrators will be obtained. It is possible that opinions of professional educators may be obtained. Again, empirical data will be valuable in evaluating the project.

SCHEDULES Pilot schools use one of the four following plans in conducting their classes:

Plan A.

Stenographic Block—3 hours a day.

A substitute for Typing 2, Shorthand 2, Office Practice.

Credit may be granted in Advanced Shorthand, Advanced Typing, Office Practice.

Prerequisites: 2 semesters of typing.
2 semesters of shorthand.

Plan B.

Modified Steno Block — 2 hours a day.

A substitute for Shorthand 2, Office Practice.

Credit may be granted in Advanced Shorthand, Office Practice.

1. See Appendix A for a sample copy of the memorandum of agreement between each state and Michigan State University.

Prerequisites: 2 semesters of typing.
2 semesters of shorthand.

Plan C.

Clerical Block — 2 hours a day.

A substitute for Typing 2, Office Practice.

Credit may be granted in Advanced Typing, Office Practice.

Prerequisites: 2 semesters of typing.

Plan D.

Special Clerical Block (low Achiever) — 3 hours.

A substitute for Typing 2, Office Practice.

Credit may be granted in Advanced Typing, Office Practice.

Prerequisites: 2 semesters of typing.

COOPERATING SCHOOLS Selection of Pilot Schools. Thirty-nine pilot schools were selected in the five states. The schools were recommended to the project leader by the state coordinators who used the following guidelines for selection:

1. Availability of 16 to 20 students
2. A typewriter and desk for each student
3. A teacher who is vocationally certified by the respective State
4. Equipment;
   ___Typewriters
   ___Desks (L-shaped preferred)
   ___Long Carriage typewriter(s)
   ___Electric full-keyboard adding machine
   ___Electric ten-key adding machine
   ___Printing calculator(s)
   ___Electric automatic or semi-automatic rotary calculator(s)
   ___Electric stencil duplicator (and supplies)
   ___Fluid process duplicator (and supplies)
   ___Illuminated drawing boards, writing and drawing sheets
   ___Styli, lettering guides, plates
   ___Transcribing machine(s) audio device (for shorthand speed development, including teacher prepared materials)
   ___Demonstration stand
   ___Collating rack or machine

Each State Coordinator was free to select the pilot schools in his state as long as the Coordinator deemed the school as experimental and innovative. Many schools were anxious to participate in the project, indicating willingness of administrators and teachers to experiment.

The number of schools in each state and some other descriptive information are shown in Table 1.

Selection of students. The selection of students was difficult in some schools because the selection of the pilot schools was made after student registrations. However, school administrators cooperated wonderfully and experienced great success in obtaining more than the minimum number of students in the pilot schools. The desired number of students for each class was 16 to 20, although some schools exceeded twenty with the approval of the research associates.

PROJECT CONSULTANTS (Advisory Group) A group of business educators are serving as professional consultants to the project. These consultants met at Michigan State University, February 19-22, 1966, to review the objectives and plans for the project and to make recommendations regarding the research and developmental aspects of the project. The consultants discussed the project and agreed that the project had great potential and implications for business education at the local, state, and national level. However, they verified our concerns regarding the many research problems involved in the project. They indicated the importance of the developmental process in curriculum development.

Because the project is both developmental and research in character, the discussion included plans for implementation of the project and for continuous study to determine research possibilities to demonstrate the value of the block-time approach.

The State Coordinators and State Research Consultants attending the workshop were interested in the research as well as implementing and operating the project. They discussed the problems involved in implementing the project in their respective states, including the selection of pilot schools, state workshops, release time for State Research Consultants, instructional material, finances, qualifications of Research Associates, travel, and miscellaneous problems.

NATIONAL SEMINAR A National Seminar for State Coordinators, State Research Consultants, and Research Associates was held at Michigan State University from June 13 to June 17, 1966. (See Appendix B for the participants.)

All states had selected their pilot schools and research associates by June, 1966. The main objective of this workshop was to acquaint the Research Associates with the operation of the project. Another

TABLE 1

Location, Number and Size of Pilot Schools in the Vocational Office Block-Time Project

State	School	City	Plan	Enrollment
Arizona				
	Tucson High School	Tucson	B	25
	Alhambra High School	Phoenix	B	34
	South Mountain High	Phoenix	B	23
	Tempe High School	Tempe	B	10
	Sunnyside High School	Tucson	B	22
	Scottsdale High School	Scottsdale	B	15
	Yuma High School	Yuma	B	27
	Maryvale High School	Phoenix	B	32
	Sunnyslope High School	Phoenix	B	15
Florida				
	Satellite High School	Satellite Beach	C	12
	Paxon High School	Jacksonville	A	16
	Seabreeze High School	Daytona Beach	A	15
	Santa Fe High School	Alachua	A	29
	Kathleen High School	Lakeland	B	12
	James Rickard High	Tallahassee	A	16
	Columbia High School	Lake City	A	15
	King High School	Tampa	A	21
Michigan				
	Grosse Pointe High	Grosse Pointe	B	18
	Lakeshore High School	Stevensville	B	13
	Roosevelt High School	Wyandotte	C	20
	Brandywine High School	Niles	C	13
	Eastern High School	Lansing	A	22
	Petoskey High School	Petoskey	B&C	15
	Highland Park High	Highland Park	C	15
	Willow Run High School	Ypsilanti	C	17
	Creston High School	Grand Rapids	A	16
New Jersey				
	Watchung Hills High	Plainfield	B	18
	Rancocas Valley High	Mount Holly	B	23
	Notre Dame High School	Trenton	B	21
	Northern Highlands High	Allendale	B	10
	Rahway High School	Rahway	B	*50
	Oakcrest High School	Mays Landing	B	15
Washington				
	Kent-Meridian High	Kent	C	18
	Wm Winlock Miller High	Olympia	C	24
	John Rogers High School	Spokane	A	*50
	Mountlake Terrace High	Mountlake Terrace	B	20
	Evergreen High School	Seattle	B	12
	Inglemoor High School	Bothell	B	16
	Hudson's Bay High	Vancouver	C	*26

*2 sections

objective was to involve the Research Associates in the development of instructional materials. Other objectives included (1) professional development of Research Associates, (2) review acceptable teaching methods and recent developments in each method suitable for a block class, (3) exchange of ideas among Research Associates about conducting a block class, and (4) the acquaintance of all project personnel with one another.

The operation of the project and its relation to the Research and Development Program was presented by the Program Director and the Project Leader. The roles of the State Coordinator, State Research Consultant, and the Research Associate were explained and discussed. As the discussion progressed, it soon became evident that each individual was enthused and excited about her involvement in the project. This enthusiasm is very important to the success of the project — it indicates that the participants are willing to develop and experiment with innovative methods and ideas in an experimental and developmental situation.

State Research Consultants led discussions on different methods usable in block-class situations. Many good ideas were presented by experienced block-class teachers.

During part of each day, each Research Associate met in a group according to the type of block class which she would be teaching. Each group studied and made suggested changes on the respective course outlines and instructional materials. Their suggestions were presented to the entire group for further study and consideration. Their final recommendations and suggestions were studied and most of them incorporated in the refinement of the instructional materials which were distributed to all project personnel for use during the 1966-67 school year.

MATERIALS DEVELOPED Each pilot school uses the textbooks and other instructional materials required or selected at the local pilot school. The project recognizes this as a prerogative of the local schools.

There was a need, however, for some instructional material for the project: namely, a teachers manual for the block class, a course outline for each plan, and integrated exercises. These materials have the primary objective of relating different subject areas into a simulated office task.

The basis for the content of the integrated exercises is the major subjects taught in each block

plan. These exercises simulate an office task as much as possible.

Each research associate is expected to submit an evaluation of the instructional materials at the end of the 1966-67 school year. Evaluation will be made of each unit. This evaluation will provide the basis for possible future revision of each unit. Basically, the same materials with some revision will be used during the 1967-68 school year.

STATE WORKSHOPS Some Research Associates attended workshops sponsored by State Departments or Universities in Arizona, Michigan, and Washington during the summer, 1966. Although these workshops were not directly related to the project, each contributed to the professional development of the Research Associates attending the workshop.

Research Associates in Michigan met on November 7, 1966. The objectives of this one-day workshop were to exchange ideas and experiences based on the classroom experiences from the opening of school in September and to evaluate proposed changes in the report forms. Each Research Associate benefited from the experiences of other Research Associates and planned to use some of the ideas presented. The proposed new report forms were acceptable.

Research Associates of the state of Washington met on October 20, 1966, in conjunction with the Washington State Business Education Association. They discussed their class experiences and suggested proposed changes in the report forms.

In Florida, Research Associates attended a Vocational Office Education Workshop in October sponsored by the State Department of Education. Each Research Associate was able to exchange ideas with other teachers in Florida.

DATA COLLECTION The first form used (Appendix C) was a daily log submitted each week by the Research Associates. The form was a description of the activities in the classroom and the amount of time devoted to the major activities as indicated in the course outline. The form enabled the Research Associate to comment on her procedure and any special activity of her class.

Three forms were devised to replace the Daily Log in November 1966. A time chart (Appendix D) is used to record the amount of time spent on major activities included in the course outline. The amount of time actually spent on the major activities will be compared with the recommended allotted time at the end of the year and a possible revision made. Perhaps too little or too much time has been alloted to some major activities. Of course, each Research Associate is allowed to adjust for student differences.

A major activity report form (Appendix E) was prepared for use by each Research Associate in submitting a description of her class procedure in the subject area covered. This reports the progress of the class, the method(s) used by the Research Associate, method of student evaluation, and what changes or recommendations the Research Associate would make the next time she taught the activity. Provision is made for the Research Associate to analyze and evaluate her conduct of the class.

An integrated activity report form (Appendix F) was prepared for use after the completion of an integrated exercise. This exercise may be one specifically prepared for the project or one prepared by the Research Associate for her class. This report covers the major areas integrated, the method(s) used by the Research Associate, the method of student evaluation, and recommended changes the next time the Research Associate taught the exercise. Provision is made for the Research Associate to analyze, pro and con, her teaching of the integrated exercise.

The real evaluation of a class comes when the class members are on a job after completing the class. However, evaluation must be made while the class is in progress. Because there is no satisfactory method of evaluating an on-going class, empirical data becomes very important. The opinions of Research Associates will be collected concerning many facets of the block classes. The same type of empirical data will be collected from State Research Consultants who have visited each class in process and will make more visits during the year.

Plans will be made for a follow-up of the graduates possibly at the end of three months, six months, twelve months, and two years.

THE FUTURE

Definite plans for the future depend upon the availability of funds and the willingness of the States and/or pilot schools to participate. At present it seems that the five states now participating will continue to participate. The Program Director will visit each state in the near future to determine their plans for next year.

Workshops are necessary for the successful operation of the project and these workshops depend on

availability of funds. We plan to have each state hold a workshop before or at the end of the 1966-67 school year. The purpose of such a workshop will be to evaluate the project in each state for the 1966-67 school year and make suggestions and recommendations for next year's operation.

There are tentative plans for one Research Associate from each state to attend a work session at Michigan State to revise and refine the instructional materials for the school year 1967-68. The State Research Consultants would attend this session.

During the 1967-68 school year, plans are to have each state hold at least two workshops, one early in the year to orient new Research Associates to the project and teaching in a block class, and one at the end of the year to evaluate the year's operation. The number of pilot schools will not be expanded; in fact, the number may be decreased. Each state may expand by having associate schools on a self-supporting basis. Instructional materials will be furnished to these schools by Michigan State University. The associate schools will provide data the same as the pilot schools.

Probably, the same type of reports will be used during the 1967-68 school year. These will be used to analyze the procedure of the block class.

Michigan State University may use the clinical school sites for various research studies . The number of pilot schools may vary in each study and the same pilot schools may or may not be used for some studies.

Anticipated studies pertain to student achievement in the areas of shorthand, transcription, typewriting, and other major areas covered in the course outline.

These research studies may be performed by different individuals but all will be coordinated by Michigan State University.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
In Vocational-Technical Education

310 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University

Memorandum of Agreement

_____, 1966

The Research and Development Program in Vocational Education at Michigan State University and the State Department of Education, Vocational Division, State of _____, agree in principle via this memorandum to form a consortium for the purposes of conducting a pilot-demonstration research program in vocational office education. This agreement is one of cooperative intent to work for the improvement of vocational education, rather than a legal contract.

The research activity to which this memorandum pertains is mainly supported by a grant from the U.S.O.E. to M.S.U. under contract #OE-5-85-111.

Both M.S.U. and the vocational division of the state of _____, agree to carry out the research effort beginning February 1, 1966 and continue at least through the first phase ending June 15, 1967 depending on U.S. Office of Education continuation of fund support. The personnel at M.S.U. and in _____ recognize that each should be free to suggest modification of this research program at any time and that either may withdraw at any time.

A. General Design of the Research Program
   1. The purpose of the project is to test the value of a block-time approach for advanced office education at the secondary level to determine whether block-time patterns provide greater occupational competency than traditional single-period instruction.
   2. In each cooperating state several high schools will be selected in which variations of block-time patterns will be tried out. Each school is to select a teacher who will be designated as a research associate and teach in the block. Some schools will have experimental-control sections while others will operate experimental programs only.
   3. In each state a research consultant will be designated as well as a project research coordinator.
   4. The research director and his staff at M.S.U. will develop experimental curriculum materials as well as evaluative systems and instruments, analyze data and prepare reports.
   5. Initially the period of experimentation in the pilot schools is to be the 1966-67 school year. It is expected that further experimentation will continue through 1970 to provide demonstration schools for diffusion of innovative curricula.

B. Responsibilities of Michigan State University R & D Program
   1. Provide basic design of the study, including an evaluation scheme.
   2. Develop experimental curriculum and facilities models and allied curriculum guides, unit outlines, and other needed instructional materials.
   3. Develop evaluative criteria and allied evaluation instruments.
   4. Act as the central project leadership group and negotiate and operate the contract with the U.S.O.E.
   5. Provide to cooperating states and pilot schools:
      a. All experimental instructional materials in quantity.
      b. Consultative assistance through state visitations and conferences and written correspondence.
      c. All out-of-state travel to working conferences approved by M.S.U. for staff and teacher research associates.
      d. Reimbursement for one period daily of teacher time, devoted to research activity other than teaching and not otherwise reimbursed by a state department. The reimbursement is not to exceed $1,000 per teacher and is to be calculated on the teacher's 10 month salary base.
      e. In-state travel and living costs for workshops for pilot school teachers.
   6. Evaluate new procedures and prepare research reports.

C. The State of _____ will provide to this research program:
   1. The services of a state staff member to act as State Research Coordinator with such duties:
      (a) Select schools
      (b) Negotiate contracts
      (c) Administer finances
      (d) Carry out publicity
      (e) Formulate policies
      (f) Act as liaison with Center
   2. The services of state staff or approved teacher education staff to act as State Research Consultant with duties to:
      (a) Train teachers
      (b) Carry on supervision of research associates
      (c) Disseminate materials
      (d) Gather research data
      (e) Consultant on local program problems
   3. Reimbursement to pilot schools for teacher instructional time and equipment in accordance with state policies.
   4. Designation of from _____ to _____ schools, at least some of which are experimental-control situations. Pilot schools are to represent varying size classes existent in the state and situations while the state research coordinator deems to be advantageous for innovative programs.

D. Pilot Schools will provide:
   1. A qualified teacher and necessary laboratory-type instructional space.
   2. An office (or the block-classroom) for the teacher-research associate.
   3. Administrative support for the research endeavor.

4. Access to pupil personnel information as required by the research activity.
5. Teacher time for attendance at conferences and workshops programmed for participants in the research activity.
6. Instruction that follows the outline prescribed for the research program.
7. The teacher-research associate will:
   (a) Carry out instruction
   (b) Assist in evaluation, reporting, and data gathering

E. Other Considerations:

1. All research data and reports are confidential until formally released by the M.S.U. Project Director in conformity with the terms of the U.S.O.E. contract.
2. Each state may select in addition to the pilot schools a number of schools to be known as associate schools. These programs receive instructional materials and staff consultation but no reimbursement for teacher research time will be allotted by M.S.U.
3. Pilot schools and state departments involved in this research program are considered for payment purposes as providing consultant services; subject to U.S.O.E. approval, payments will be made by purchase order directly to schools involved.

/s/ _____

Peter G. Haines, Director
Research and Development Program
in Vocational-Technical Education
Michigan State University

/s/ _____

Supervisor, Office Education
State of _____

PGH:mc

APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANTS, NATIONAL SEMINAR IN VOE, JUNE 13-17, 1966, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MICH.

ARIZONA	
Macon, Mr. Charles	State Department of Education, Phoenix
Driska, Mr. Robert	Arizona State University, Tempe
Bazzetta, Mrs. Mary	Tucson High School, Tucson
Jenkins, Mrs. Domenica	Sunnyslope High School, Phoenix
Kelly, Mrs. Cheryl	Alhambra High School, Phoenix
Kirk, Mrs. Beverly	South Mountain High School, Phoenix
Myers, Mrs. Mary Lou	Tempe High School, Tempe
Olszewski, Miss Lydia	Sunnyside High School, Tucson
Sawaia, Miss Josephine	Scottsdale High School, Scottsdale
Sorensen, Mrs. Stella	Yuma High School, Yuma
Wager, Mrs. Lola	Maryvale High School, Phoenix
FLORIDA	
Hiers, Mrs. Bess	State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida
Crews, Dr. James	University of Florida, Gainesville
Ashley, Mrs. Peggy	Satellite High School, Satellite Beach
Brinkley, Miss Gloria	Paxon High School, Jacksonville
Carr, Mrs. Anne	Seabreeze High School, Daytona Beach
Hines, Mrs. Louise	Santa Fe High School, Alachua
Long, Mrs. Veda A.	Kathleen High School, Lakeland
Mobley, Mrs. Vera H.	James Rickards High School, Tallahassee
Ogden, Mrs. Meriba	Columbia High School, Lake City
Stephens, Mrs. Claudia	King High School, Tampa
MICHIGAN	
Haines, Dr. Peter G.	Michigan State University, East Lansing
McBeth, Prof. John	Michigan State University, East Lansing
Halvas, Mr. Earl	State Department of Education, Lansing
French, Miss Frances	Grosse Pointe High School, Grosse Pointe
Hebda, Mr. Edmund	Roosevelt High School, Wyandotte
Larson, Gordon	Stephenson High School, Stephenson
Lloyd, Mrs. Doris	Eastern High School, Lansing
Moskovis, L. Michael	Michigan State University, East Lansing
Price, Mrs. Elaine	Petoskey High School, Petoskey
Stearns, Karl	Michigan State University, East Lansing
Ward, Mrs. Pauline	Creston High School, Grand Rapids
Wardell, Carolyn	Michigan State University, East Lansing
NEW JERSEY	
Thomas, Mr. Ellis	State Department of Education, Trenton
Shack, Mrs. Chrystine	State Department of Education, Trenton
Adkins, Mrs. Marjorie	Watchung Hills Regional High School, Plainfield
Chance, Mrs. Lillian	Rancocas Valley Regional High School, Mount Holly
Sister Mary Eloise, RSM	Notre Dame High School, Trenton
Lapham, Mrs. Louanne	Northern Highlands Regional High School, Allendale
McLaughlin, Mrs. Myrna	Rayway High School, Rayway
Reed, Mrs. Lois	Oakcrest High School, Mays Landing
WASHINGTON	
Roley, Mr. Dennis	State Department of Education, Olympia
Perkins, Dr. Edward	Washington State University, Pullman
Byrd, Mr. Ross	Washington State University, Pullman
Bates, Mrs. Ruby A.	Kent School District No. 415, Kent

Bushnell, Miss Agnes	Olympia School District No. 11, Olympia
Church, Mrs. Ruth C.	Spokane School District No. 81, Spokane
Funk, Mrs. Beverley	Edmonds School District No. 15, Lynnwood
Humbert, Mrs. Helen	Evergreen High School, Seattle
Klossner, Mrs. Helen	Vancouver School District No. 37, Vancouver

APPENDIX C: DAILY LOG

Vocational Office Block Project
Research and Development Program
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

NAME_____

SCHOOL ADDRESS_____

DAILY LOG

Day of the Week_____ Date_____

I.	Major Activity(ies): (from Teacher's Manual, page 10)
II.	Time spent on each major activity:
III.	Desired outcome(s) of each major activity:
IV.	Contents of major activity(ies):
V.	Special comments on I-IV:
VI.	Method(s) & techniques of teaching for each major activity: (narrative description)
VII.	Activity(ies) performed by student (narrative description):
VIII.	General comment:

If additional space is needed, please use the back of this page.

APPENDIX D: TIME DISTRIBUTION

TIME DISTRIBUTION

Teacher_____ Plan_____

School_____

City & State_____

Week Beginning_____ Ending_____

	Major Activities	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Total	Cum. from Nov. 14
I.	Shorthand (skill building)							
	Transcription							
	Skill Bldg. Typing							
	Production Typing							
	Class Orientation							
	Mgt. Services							
	Machine Transcript.							
	Calculating Mchs.							
	Duplicating							
	Communications							
	Mail Procedures							
	Using Info. Serv.							
	Filing & Records Mgt.							
	Bus. Math., Fin. & Record Keeping							
	Human Relations							
	Data Processing							
	Transportation & Travel							
	Model Office							
	Independent Investigation							
	School Business							
	Testing							
II.	Integrative Activities							

APPENDIX E: MAJOR ACTIVITY REPORTING FORM

Teacher_____ School_____

Plan A_____, B_____, C_____, D_____

City & State_____

MAJOR ACTIVITY REPORTING FORM

MAJOR ACTIVITY_____

	Evaluation Comments
OBJECTIVE (s)	OBJECTIVE (s)
CONTENT	CONTENT
METHOD (Technique)	METHOD
MEANS OF EVALUATING ACTIVITY (Include test and all other evaluation schemes)	EVALUATION COMMENTS

SUGGESTIONS AND/OR GENERAL COMMENTS
(Use other side if necessary)

APPENDIX F: INTEGRATIVE ACTIVITY REPORTING FORM

Teacher_____ School_____

Plan A_____, B_____, C_____, D_____

City & State_____

INTEGRATIVE ACTIVITY REPORTING FORM

MAJOR ACTIVITIES INTEGRATED_____

	Evaluation Comments
OBJECTIVE (s)	OBJECTIVE (s)
CONTENT	CONTENT
METHOD (Technique)	METHOD
MEANS OF EVALUATING ACTIVITY (Include tests and all other evaluating schemes)	EVALUATION COMMENTS

SUGGESTIONS AND/OR GENERAL COMMENTS
(Use other side if necessary)

504-.9M-77(86)CR/201/7D/006

The Research And Evaluation reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

This report is one of a series of final reports pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

PROJECT 201

A Study of a Block-Time Schedule for Teaching Vocational Office Practices

PROJECT 301

A Pilot Program Comparing Cooperative and Project Methods of Teaching Distributive Education

PROJECT 501

Shared-Time (Dual Enrollment) Concept for Area Vocational Education Programs

PROJECT 601

The Development and Demonstration of Unified Vocational Education Programs in Small Rural Area High Schools

PROJECT 701

Evaluation Systems for Local Programs of Vocational-Technical Education

PROJECT 801

Hospitality Education Curriculum Development Project

CONTRACT OE5-85-111 Report

A Developmental Vocational Education Research and Teacher Education Program Based on a Clinical School Concept

For copies of the above reports and for further information contact:

Director
Research and Development Program in
Vocational-Technical Education
115 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823